

REMARKS

Claims 8, 9, 14-16, 18 and 25-44 are presently pending in the application. Claims 29-44 are allowed. Claims 1-7, 10-13, 17 and 19-24 are rejected. Claims 8, 9, 14-16, 18 and 25-28 are objected to. Claims 8, 14, 18 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 10-13, 17 and 19-24 have been cancelled. The specification and drawings stand as filed.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The basis for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification, Claims and Drawings as originally filed.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1 and 19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,595,556.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is now moot and request withdrawal of the double patenting rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McNaughton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,086,118).

Applicants have cancelled claims 19 and 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 17 and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowell (U.S. Pat. No. 1,182,170) in view of McNaughton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,086,118).

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-7, 10-13, 17 and 19-23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 8, 9, 14-16, 18 and 25-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have rewritten claims 8, 14 and 25 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants respect withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 29-44.


CONCLUSION

All of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If it is believed that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600. Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated November 1, 2004

By 
Donald G. Walker – Reg. No. 44390
Attorneys for Applicants

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P. O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
Phone: 248/641-1600
Facsimile: 248/641-0270

DGW/jmm